



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/516,402	03/01/2000	Neta Amit	MSI-2692US	2983
22801 7590 06/15/2009				
LEE & HAYES, PLLC 601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 1400 SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2437				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/15/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/516,402

**Applicant(s)**

AMIT ET AL.

**Examiner**

MICHAEL PYZOCHA

**Art Unit**

2437

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1-10 and 22 have been considered. Claims 11-21 are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Amendment filed 05/14/2009 has been received and considered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer (US 6141423) in view of Kao et al. (US 7451147) and further in view of Murakami (US5845082).

As per claim 1, Fischer discloses sending a request for account credentials from an originating account associated with an unpublished object at a dispatch associated with a published object, the request directed to the published object associated with the dispatch includes identification of the unpublished object associated with the originating account (see column 10 lines 14-42); authenticating the originating account at the dispatch (see column 11 lines 4-16); and, upon authenticating the originating account, sending an emblem that includes an object and credential, for an account to the originating account, the emblem sent to the unpublished object associated with the

originating account and having the identification as included with the request (see column 12 lines 12-18 and Figures 4 and 6).

Fischer fails to disclose that the request is for network account credentials where the originating account is authenticated and the network credentials are returned.

However, Kao et al. teaches requesting network account credentials where the originating account is authenticated and the network credentials are returned (see column 3 lines 33-50).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the credentials of Fischer to be network credentials.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow a user to access information stored remotely using passwords stored in a central database (see Kao et al. column 3 lines 33-50).

The modified Fischer and Kao et al. system fails to disclose that the request for credentials is for use in completing an assigned job.

However, Murakami teaches requesting and receiving credentials (a token) in order to complete an assigned job (see column 1 lines 59-67).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to request credentials to complete an assigned job in the modified Fischer and Kao et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to prevent the same resource from being used by a plurality of clients (see Murakami column 1 lines 59-67).

As per claim 2, the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system discloses the request and returned password (i.e. emblem) are unencrypted (see Kao et al. column 3 lines 33-50).

As per claims 3 and 4, Examiner takes official notice that message queues and files are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize message queues or files in order to store or transport data. It is noted that since Applicant has not traversed the Official Notice the above statements (regarding claims 3 and 4) are taken as admitted prior art (See MPEP 2144.03).

As per claim 5, the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system discloses that the emblem comprises a token (see Fischer Figure 4).

As per claim 6, the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system discloses the network account for which the emblem is sent from to dispatch to the originating account comprises a batch account of the dispatch (see Kao et al. column 3 lines 33-50).

As per claim 7, the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system discloses, sending an emblem for the network account to the originating account comprises remoting a batch account to the originating account, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the batch account (see Kao et al. column 3 lines 33-50).

As per claim 8, the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system discloses the network account for which the emblem is sent from the dispatch to the originating

account comprises an agent account of an agent (see Fischer column 11 lines 4-16 and column 12 lines 12-18 and Kao et al. column 3 lines 33-50).

As per claim 22, the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system discloses the dispatch is a device within a network that sends network account credentials to the originating account (see Kao et al. column 3 lines 33-50).

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ault et al. (US 5974566).

As per claim 9, the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system fails to explicitly disclose proxy logging on to an agent and remoting an agent account to the originating account upon proxy log on to the agent, such that the emblem comprises an emblem for the agent account.

However, Ault et al. teaches such proxy logging on (see column 1 line 51 through column 2 line 20).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use proxy logging on in the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system.

Motivation to do so would have been to serve repeated login requests more quickly (see Ault et al. column 2 lines 8-20).

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Patel et al. (US 6438690).

As per claim 10, the modified Fischer, Kao et al. and Murakami system fails to disclose the emblem expiring and renewing the about to expire emblem.

However, Patel et al. teaches renewing expired emblems (see column 8 lines 23-26).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to renew about to expire emblems in the modified Fischer and Kao et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow the user a convenient method for reminding and renewing information (see Patel et al. column 8 lines 23-26).

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hudson teaches using credentials for assigned jobs.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Pyzocha/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2437